

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER]. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that we would complete this bill an hour and a half ago. I dislike seeing politics brought into a library bill, as seems to have been the case today under the leadership of my friend from New Jersey.

This bill originally was sponsored by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM], back in 1956 and was extended under the leadership of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] by an almost unanimous vote in this House. It was passed by the Senate committee a few weeks ago by a vote of 89 to 7. Why in the world we are wasting so much time on a bill that so many people in every congressional district want is more than I can understand. I do not know of a library in any congressional district, I do not know of one person interested in the education of our youth in any congressional district, I do not know of a State officeholder of any State in the Union, who is opposed to this particular bill. But under the leadership of the Republican Party in the House of Representatives this afternoon we are seeing for the first time since 1956 partisan politics injected into the question of the youth of our country and into our library situation.

As far as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER] is concerned, there is no one I know of in our country who knows more about the needs of the libraries than the people attached to the American Library Association. I do not know of any person who has given us more information on the needs of the libraries than those American Library Association representatives who are operating here in the Nation's Capital. When the gentleman puts the American Library Association in the same company as the American Farm Bureau and others, he is doing a great disservice to everyone who has a sincere interest in libraries all over our country.

The American Library Association is not a lobby organization. It is an association of librarians, dedicated librarians, who are working with great diligence to improve library facilities all over the country.

The Washington staff of this associa-

tion has done a distinct service for all the people of every congressional district in these United States. I am personally grateful for the efforts they have expended to improve the library situation throughout the entire country for I know that any progress they are able to make nationwide will have a definite, salutary effect on my own congressional district and the people I am privileged to represent.

If there is a State in the Union that needs a bill like this, that needs help to educate their youth, to establish schools and to get rid of poverty and illiteracy as we know it today, it is the State of Kentucky that the gentleman who has just spoken comes from. I do not believe there is a State in the Union that needs help more than the State of Kentucky. Why he is up here trying to emasculate this program is more than I can understand.

When the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FREELINGHUYSEN] gets up here and tries to emasculate this program, to defeat it, if you will, it disturbs me. Coming from the second most urbanized State in the country, second only to my own State of Rhode Island, in my opinion he is doing a disservice to every single person, not only in his own congressional district but in the entire State of New Jersey. They need this legislation just as much as Kentucky does.

I can understand my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], for the opposition he takes because he has always opposed it. He opposed it back in 1956, he opposed it when the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] tried to get it extended, he is opposed to it now. He is not in favor of amending it. He is opposed to the enactment of this kind of legislation.

Normally I can understand opposition to a bill but in this case I cannot understand it because Ohio is as bad off as any State in the Union. I just do not see any Member from Ohio voting against this kind of legislation or voting for amendments that have the effect and intent of killing the legislation.

As far as I know the leaders in every congressional district in the State of Ohio have endorsed this type of legislation. I know when \$7.5 million was available there was not a person from Ohio who ever got up on the floor and said, "We do not need the \$7.5 million." When the gentleman from New Jersey gets up here and says, "No, I want to give them a little more money, I want to give them \$15 million, I want to raise the population ratio from 10,000 to 20,000," that does not mean a thing. It is just an attempt and a very obvious attempt to defeat this legislation.

I am sorry that the leadership on the Republican side has allowed politics to be brought into what should be a non-partisan issue here today, the libraries of our country. In my particular area, and I do not think mine is any different from Ohio or New Jersey, since 1956 the loaning of books has doubled, the amount of money from 1956 that has been appropriated at the local and State level,

has increased by 100 percent. That is what this legislation has accomplished.

Mr. Chairman, my belief in the importance of public libraries is well known. I also believe that this bill, the Library Services and Construction Act, will make possible a giant step toward public library services of real excellence for every citizen.

Within its limitations, the Library Services Act of 1956 has had amazing success in providing rural readers with more and better books. Rhode Island began participating in this program in 1958. Since that time 43 rural community libraries have received book grants, professional advisory services, and centralized book preparation. The supervisor of this program, Miss Elizabeth G. Myer, has reported that the number of books loaned from these libraries doubled between 1956 and 1963. Local expenditures for public libraries also increased about 100 percent over the same period. The substantial increase in the use of books is tangible evidence of improved facilities. The significant increase in local appropriations demonstrates the success of the program in stimulating increased State and local financial effort.

The progress in other States has matched that in Rhode Island. Since 1961, all eligible States and territories have been participating in this State-plan, matching-grant program. The accomplishments of the act have been recognized and applauded, not only by librarians and congressional sponsors, but most importantly, by the 38 million rural readers who have used the improved services of their local libraries. It is essential to remember that this program is not for State libraries, or for local libraries, or for librarians. It is for the 128 million citizens who neither have no local library whatever or who must use overcrowded, obsolete, and understaffed library facilities.

The limitation of the present program to areas of less than 10,000 population has been a real handicap to every State. It has denied benefits to the sorely pressed larger libraries and, in turn, prevented their strengths from being fully utilized in extending services to rural and suburban areas. In Rhode Island, a heavily urbanized State, the number of people eligible for participation will increase from 146,054 to 859,438 if H.R. 4879 is passed.

The rural population will continue to be helped under the proposed amendment; in fact, perhaps better than before. By virtue of combining resources of all libraries—large, medium, and small, not to mention bookmobiles, a comprehensive plan of library service can be achieved. The necessary efficiency in public library operation for the people of the United States can be achieved only by having public libraries of various sizes and in different localities cooperate jointly in the use of the resources of each. This bill will facilitate this situation.

An essential component of a good public library system is adequate physical facilities. The present act specifically prohibits the use of funds for the pur-

chase or construction of buildings or for the purchase of land because it is a library services program and deals with villages and farming communities. In Rhode Island and throughout the country too many of our public libraries are struggling with overcrowded, dilapidated, and makeshift quarters. Other communities have long outgrown the familiar Carnegie buildings which, on the average, date from about 1920. Of all public libraries in the Nation, only 4 percent have been constructed since 1940. H.R. 4879, the Library Services and Construction Act, will provide \$20 million in matching grants to give assistance and encouragement to communities like these.

Some colleagues seem to be worried about the proposed great expenditure for the services and facilities of public libraries. In actuality, the Federal Government is contributing only a small percentage to the deficiencies in funds for operating adequately our public libraries. In fiscal year 1961, for example, the total operating expenditures for public libraries was \$285 million, whereas according to minimum standards formulated by the American Library Association, the total amount spent for services should have been \$480 million for that year, an annual gap in operating expenditures of \$195 million. This bill proposes that in order to lessen the deficiency, the Federal Government should contribute for library services the sum of \$25 million, about 12 percent of the gap.

The Library Services Act of 1956 has made possible an excellent beginning. I am so impressed by this progress that I am confident of continued accelerating accomplishment. H.R. 4879, by correcting lacks in the present program, will advance the cause of good libraries to the point where each citizen can expect his public library to be an educational resource of excellence.

The American public library is a solid fortress in the war on poverty. Free to all, the public library meets the user on his own terms by providing the kinds of books and other library materials which he needs. Books, films, and recordings are expensive. Those adults who have just begun to read English, those laborers whose jobs have been automated, those immigrants whose original culture has not prepared them for life in our big cities cannot possibly afford to buy the informational materials they require. The free public library is their most important single resource for this kind of assistance.

I believe that H.R. 4879, the Library Services and Construction Act will allow States and localities to move swiftly and strongly toward the goal of good public library service for every citizen. This bill will greatly improve the present program being carried out under the Library Services Act of 1956. This ongoing program has had excellent success. Every eligible State and territory is fully participating and they are ready to move in this expanded program. Every State has been handicapped by the present limitation of assistance to areas of under 10,000 population. My State is heavily urbanized and this restriction denies as-

sistance to more than 700,000 persons. The removal of this limitation will aid the struggling public libraries in our urban and suburban areas. In addition, it will permit the efficient use of their resources in a way which will make them available to all those who need them, whether these users live in the city, the suburb, the small town, or in the open country.

It is impossible to imagine good public libraries without efficient, functional buildings. Far too many libraries, in Rhode Island, and throughout the land are rendered ineffective because of overcrowded and obsolete buildings. H.R. 4879 anticipates the joint need for improved services and for renewed physical facilities. The provision in this bill for construction is based on the demonstrated success of the State plan concept. The requirement of matching funds from State and local sources assures that this will be a program of stimulation and encouragement. I believe that every level of government has a continuing responsibility for building library services of real excellence. The partnership program which has developed under the Library Services Act now involves State, local, and Federal efforts in a joint undertaking to this end. Now our goal is to improve and extend this program so that all aspects of the problem can be attacked at the same time.

I am confident that H.R. 4879, if passed, will be a historic turning point in public library development. No aspect of our entire educational system is more important than the firm foundation which is provided by having good libraries freely and conveniently available. I support the Library Services and Construction Act and urge its prompt enactment.

Mr. Chairman, a previous reference has been made to the new budget. In view of this I should like to set the record straight. Here are the facts.

The fiscal 1965 budget which President Johnson has submitted today breaks new ground:

It reduces total Federal spending by \$500 million—yet, within that total, it provides for major increases in the fields of education, health, labor, and welfare.

It proposes to cut the Federal deficit in half—yet it calls for an \$11 billion tax reduction, and provides the largest year-to-year economic stimulus of any peacetime budget.

It is perfectly natural to wonder how a single budget can accomplish these various—and at first glance, contradictory—objectives. But, Mr. Chairman, I submit that a closer examination will show how this budget is a closely reasoned, careful program with clear and straightforward objectives and a consistent, philosophical foundation.

In the first place, this budget is built upon the premise that frugality in Federal expenditures can be a weapon for social progress. Out of the savings made possible by a hardheaded and politically courageous review of lower priority expenditures and obsolete installation, funds have been released for use in constructive ways to help the American people—and especially to enable those mil-

lions of Americans living in poverty to help themselves. Frugality has not been practiced merely for frugality's sake. This budget proposes major increases in funds for education, youth employment opportunities, manpower training, vocational education and rehabilitation, health, and welfare. It also proposes the launching of an intensive attack against poverty in our local communities, and provides the funds for this attack. A tight budget, Mr. Chairman, need not be a stagnant one.

In the second place, this budget is a fiscally expansionary budget. But it proposes to achieve economic expansion not through a vast increase in Federal outlays, but through a major reduction and reform in taxes. In 1964 the reduction in withholding taxes provided by this budget will put some \$8 billion of additional money into the pockets of American consumers. Corporate tax reduction will increase corporate profits. And as this additional purchasing power moves through the economy, it will build new markets and create new jobs. When fully effective, the tax cut will add \$30 billion to our gross national product over and above the economy's normal growth. It will provide 2 to 3 million extra jobs, for the unemployed and the young people coming into the labor market.

Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, no other peacetime budget has ever provided as much economic stimulus as this one.

The effective way to end budget deficits is through the combination of economic expansion and expenditure control. As new jobs and new markets are created, national income rises—and, along with it, Federal revenues. Given the tremendous potential of our economy—now partially idle—economic expansion will more than yield back the revenues initially lost from tax reduction.

In short, Mr. Chairman, a careful review of the budget we have received demonstrates that fiscal expansion can accompany strict expenditure control and that a frugal budget can be a socially progressive one.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have asked unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record, inasmuch as I was denied the privilege of making these remarks on the floor, due to the fact that a motion of the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, to conclude all debate at 5:15, was adopted. I was on my feet seeking recognition at that time. A preferential motion consumed all of the time prior to 5:15 o'clock and none of those seeking recognition were permitted to speak. I will state here the remarks I had intended to make on the floor, in support of the Frelinghuysen amendment.

I have been a supporter of the Library Services Act, and believe that under it a most valuable service has been rendered, particularly in the rural areas of this Nation, including the 10th Congressional District in Missouri. I favor the continuation of this program, and would vote to increase the amount of funds which would be available under the Frelinghuysen amendment, which would also expand the areas of service.

However, I am unalterably opposed to the new sections of the bill which propose to embark upon a federally financed construction program for libraries, starting with an initial appropriation of \$20 million. Where such a program would lead, it is difficult to estimate, but judging from other programs which were started on a small scale, with very small allocations to each State, but which have grown to enormous proportions, I think it is not unlikely that such a program would eventually be expanded to a point where it would cost the Federal Government not less than \$100 million annually. Such a program is not needed, and I oppose it.

We have been reminded that when the Library Services Act was adopted in 1956, all of the sponsors and the leadership of this House assured us that this was a 5-year program, with a termination date. Some of those who made these statements back in 1956, and who are supporting the expanded program today, readily admit that they were in error at that time. I believe they are wrong today.

I think it should be understood by everyone that the present program does not expire until 1966, and there is no urgency for any legislation to merely continue the program which has been operated so successfully. As stated previously I have supported and would like to continue to support the program which has been in operation, but I cannot in good conscience vote to approve an entirely new program, which calls for the appropriation of Federal funds for the construction of library buildings in cities and communities, which are already supplied with library facilities which far exceed those which are available in our rural areas. Particularly is this true in the District of Columbia, which by no stretch of the imagination can justify the allocation of Federal funds for library construction purposes when the need is so great in our rural areas which are being benefited through the present act. We are continually pouring money down rat holes in the District of Columbia, and this proposed bill is another instance of where committees of Congress are continually trying to give the District of Columbia the status of a State, and to apportion funds to the District on that basis.

Mr. Chairman, it has been my intention to vote for a continuation, yes, even an expansion of the Library Services Act, but I will not, and I cannot in good conscience lend my support to, or vote for any legislation which proposes to appropriate money from the Federal Treasury for building library buildings in communities which already have facilities far better than those in our rural communities, which have been benefited by the present act, and which would continue to be benefited by this act if the Frelinghuysen amendment is adopted. It is my belief that to adopt the bill in its present form, will actually take away from the rural areas benefits which have been justified and which they have received in the past.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I will support amendments and motions designed to remove the construction pro-

visions, and will vote against the bill if they are permitted to remain in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER].

The preferential motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendments offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. POWELL and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 138, noes 121.

So the amendments were agreed to.